

On the cosmological backreaction for large distance modifications of gravity

Karel Van Acoleyen*

*Department of Mathematical Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University,
Krijgslaan 281, S9, 9000 Gent, Belgium*

Every theory that modifies gravity at cosmological distances and that is not already ruled out by the Solar system observations must exhibit some nonlinear mechanism that turns off the modification close to a compact matter source. Given this nonlinearity, one might expect such a theory to show a large gravitational *backreaction*, i.e. an order one influence of the small scale inhomogeneities on the large scale evolution of the Universe. We argue that this is not necessarily the case. If the dominant nonlinear terms in the equations obey a shift symmetry, the averaged effect of the nonlinearities can be small, although the effect on small scales is large. This happens for DGP (-like) modifications and so called $f(G)$ models. For both type of models the shift symmetry is part of the larger "Galilean" symmetry.

The late time acceleration of the Universe can be interpreted in two qualitatively different fashions, that are both stupefying in their own right. Either we take it as a manifestation of some omnipresent dark energy component - dynamical or not- or we view it as an indication of the breakdown of Einstein gravity at cosmological distances. It is the latter approach that we want to discuss in this paper.

Over the years, in fact already since the early days of general relativity, people have been proposing several possible modifications of the gravitational Einstein-Hilbert action, ranging from the inclusion of other curvature invariants or extra fields with non-minimal couplings to the introduction of extra dimensions for gravity. The corresponding (4D) modified Einstein equations can be written generically as:

$$G_{\mu\nu}(g) + H_{\mu\nu}(g, \pi) = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where the modification appears in the extra tensor $H_{\mu\nu}$ that is added to the Einstein tensor at the left hand side of the equation. Notice that we are not considering modifications to the minimal matter-metric coupling in the matter action that gives rise to the right hand side. From the uniqueness of spin-2 gravity [1] it follows that the modification will necessarily involve one or more new degrees of freedom. So if we want to keep the equations at most of second order in the derivatives, new fields π will appear in addition to the metric field $g_{\mu\nu}$. Actually, in this paper we will restrict ourselves to those cases where the dominant contributions to the modification arise through only one extra scalar degree of freedom, with one corresponding scalar field π . Variation of the action with respect to this new field then results in one more equation that we have to consider:

$$E_\pi(g, \pi) = 0. \quad (2)$$

As a first step in establishing the viability of a particular model as an alternative for dark energy one then looks at the evolution of the scale factor in the homogeneous (presently matter dominated) Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) universe to see if there exist

self-accelerating solutions. For those models that produce reasonable fits to the supernovae data, the transition from an ordinary matter dominated FLRW expansion to the modified evolution will be controlled by an extra dimensionfull constant μ , that is of the order of the present Hubble parameter H_0 . In any case, the modified cosmic evolution implies that on the present cosmic background the extra degree of freedom is light, with a mass $m \lesssim H_0$, giving it an effectively infinite interaction range.

Of course, the acceleration of the scale factor in the homogeneous FLRW background by itself, does not permit us to distinguish between large distance modifications of gravity and dark energy. It is only when we consider the inhomogeneous Universe that we actually live in, that the distinction makes sense. By definition, for large distance modifications of gravity, the extra light degree of freedom will couple to matter with gravitational strength. More explicitly, one can look at the first order terms of the full equations in an expansion on the cosmic background. Working in Newtonian gauge and dropping the vector and tensor perturbations that are subdominant for the scalar matter density fluctuations in our Universe, we can write the metric for the Universe as (for simplicity we will consider a flat background):

$$ds^2 \approx -dt^2(1+2\psi) + a(t)^2(1+2\phi)(dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2). \quad (3)$$

The rotational symmetry of the FLRW background then dictates the following general form for the scalar components of Eqs. (1) and (2) at linear order:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{00}^{(1)} + H_{00}^{(1)} &\approx -2\frac{\nabla^2}{a^2}\phi + \frac{\nabla^2}{a^2}\sigma_1 \approx 8\pi G_N \bar{\rho}(t)\delta(x, t), \\ G_i^{(1)} + H_i^{(1)} &\approx 2\frac{\nabla^2}{a^2}(\phi + \psi) + \frac{\nabla^2}{a^2}\sigma_2 \approx 0, \\ E_\pi^{(1)} &\approx \frac{\nabla^2}{a^2}\sigma_3 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the σ_i are linear combinations of ϕ, ψ and π . The perturbations are sourced by the matter fluctuations with relative density contrast $\delta = \Delta\rho/\bar{\rho}$ ($\bar{\rho}$ is the average mat-

ter density). We focus on the non-relativistic, subhorizon density fluctuations, for which the (effective) pressure terms can be dropped. Accordingly, we have dropped the subdominant terms on the left hand side. For instance, we do not write possible mass terms, since as we said, for those models that modify the cosmic expansion the mass on the present background will be of order H_0 . This excludes the so called chameleon models from our general treatment. For these models the mass of the extra scalar field is at least of the order $10^3 H_0$, which ties to the fact that the late time acceleration is simply driven by the cosmological constant term in the scalar field potential [2]. Our treatment does however obviously include Einstein gravity, for which the σ_i are zero. In that case the first equation is just the Poisson equation for Newton's potential ϕ in comoving coordinates, while the second equation results in $\psi \approx \phi$. The parameterization (4) also includes DGP (-like), $f(R)$ and $f(G)$ gravity [3, 4, 5]. It has been shown for instance, that in the subhorizon regime the higher dimensional DGP model is effectively described by a 4D theory with one extra scalar π that corresponds to the bending mode, which inspired the formulation of fully 4D DGP-like models [6]. Normalizing π so that $\pi \sim \phi \sim \psi$ on the cosmic background, the σ_i in (4) read:

$$2\sigma_1 = -\sigma_2 = \frac{\mu}{H}\pi, \quad \sigma_3 = -4\phi - 2\psi \pm 6(1 + \frac{\dot{H}}{3H})\pi, \quad (5)$$

with the minus sign for the self-accelerating solution [7]. For $f(R)$ and $f(G)$ gravity, π corresponds respectively to the fluctuation of the Ricci scalar and the Gauss-Bonnet invariant G [8]. And also for those models the π fluctuation mixes up with the metric fluctuations on the present cosmic background, resulting in an effective gravitational coupling to matter. This coupling will necessarily produce a markedly different phenomenology, once we bring in the cosmological probes of inhomogeneity (CMB anisotropies, large scale structure) in addition to the (large red-shift) supernovae observations that probe the FLRW background [9].

Moreover, the gravitational force is not only important on cosmological scales, but also on smaller scales. It plays a prominent role in the dynamics of galaxies, stellar and planetary systems and as such there are many additional observations that can be used to constrain possible modifications of gravity. In this context, the tightest constraints come from those systems localized on stellar system scales or smaller, where we can safely neglect any dark components to the energy-momentum tensor. And according to the observations of binary pulsars, together with the Solar system observations and the table top experiments on Earth, there is actually very little room for any modification of gravity at these distance scales. For the PPN parameter $\gamma \approx -\phi/\psi$ for instance, a careful observation of the radio waves emitted between the Cassini satellite and Earth, revealed that for the gravitational

field due to the Sun $\gamma = 1 + \mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$, in agreement with the $\gamma = 1$ result of ordinary gravity [10]. In contrast, for the modified gravity models that we discussed above, the extra scalar polarization in (4) on the present cosmic background, yields an order one modification for γ , in blatant conflict with this constraint. So these models are ruled out if the linearization (4) holds in the Solar system. Conversely, for any viable large distance modification of gravity, the Solar system should be in the gravitational non-perturbative regime [11]. To establish if this is the case for a particular model, one has to study the higher order corrections to the weak field expansion of $H_{\mu\nu}, E_\pi$. But let us first briefly review the effect of the nonlinear corrections for ordinary gravity.

For Einstein gravity the dominant higher order corrections in the quasi-static and subhorizon regime will always contain two spatial derivatives. So at second order for instance, one has the terms (taking $\psi \approx \phi$):

$$G_{00}^{(2)}, G_i^{(2)} \sim \frac{1}{a^2} \nabla_i \phi \nabla_i \phi, \quad \phi \frac{\nabla^2}{a^2} \phi. \quad (6)$$

The local effect of these terms is all too well known. Comparing them with the first order terms of G_{00} and G_i^i in (4), one finds that the linear solutions will break down when $\phi \gtrsim 1$, i.e. in the immediate neighborhood of neutron stars and black holes. So for Einstein gravity, the Newtonianly perturbed FLRW metric (3), with the fields solution of the linearized equations (4), is nearly everywhere a good approximation to the actual metric of the Universe, also for those systems with highly nonlinear density contrasts [12]. Galaxy clusters and individual galaxies for instance have $\delta \sim 1-10$, $\delta \sim 10^5$ respectively, while the potential typically has the value $\phi \sim 10^{-5}$.

As for the global effect of the terms (6), one should compare their spatial average with the zero order terms $G_{00}^{(0)}, G_i^{(0)} \sim H^2$ that appear in the Friedmann equations. This average can be evaluated from the knowledge of the density power spectrum. For the modes with wavelength L , we have $\phi_L \sim L^2 H^2 \delta$ from the Poisson equation, so that their contribution can be estimated as:

$$< \phi \nabla^2 \phi > \sim H^4 L^2 |\delta_L|^2 (\sim 4\pi G_N < \phi_L \Delta \rho_L >), \quad (7)$$

with $|\delta_L|^2$ the dimensionless spectral density. The last term here illustrates its physical meaning as the contribution to the Friedmann equations of the average gravitational potential energy of the inhomogeneities. And for our present Universe this contribution is of relative order 10^{-5} which justifies the FLRW framework for cosmology, that treats the Universe as approximately homogeneous at all scales [13].

Before looking at the particular models just yet, let us now give an intuitive argument, complementing other general arguments [6, 14], on the type of higher order terms we would generically expect for cosmologically large distance modifications of gravity. Different from

Einstein gravity, the modified equations will be nonlinear functions of curvature. So, in addition to terms of the type (6) that arise in the weak field expansion of curvature, we should also expect terms that are due to the expansion of these nonlinear functions. In particular, on cosmic backgrounds with curvature larger or of the same order as the characteristic scale of the model, $H^2 \gtrsim \mu^2$, this expansion will break down for local curvatures that are larger than the background curvature. Estimating the local curvature due to inhomogeneity as $H^2\delta$, this means that the weak field expansion should break down for all systems with nonlinear density contrasts. This is indeed what happens for DGP and $f(G)$ gravity [15, 16]. It does not happen for $f(R)$ gravity, the reason being that for those models the relevant curvature (R) due to an inhomogeneity is locked to its background value [17]. So for $f(R)$ models the linearization (4) holds in the same situations as for ordinary gravity, and the contribution of the extra light scalar in the Solar system rules these models out.

As we said, for DGP and $f(G)$ gravity, the range of validity of the linearization will be different than for Einstein gravity. From the argument above, we can write down the general form of the extra nonlinear terms as (taking $\phi \sim \psi \sim \pi$ and not being precise about the exact derivative structure):

$$H_{00}^{(2)}, H_i^{(2)}, E_\pi^{(2)} \sim \frac{\nabla^2 \phi \nabla^2 \phi}{a^4 H^2}. \quad (8)$$

Indeed, comparing these terms with the first order terms (4), we see that the linearization breaks down for $\nabla^2 \phi \sim H^2 \delta \gtrsim H^2$. The local effect of these terms for an isolated compact object of mass M can be characterized by its so called Vainshtein radius $R_V = (G_N M / H^2)^{1/3}$. Within a 'halo' of radius $\sim R_V$ that is surrounding the object, the linear solution for the gravitational field will break down [15, 16]. Of course, this by itself is not enough to ensure the screening of the extra scalar at short distances. However, for DGP gravity, full nonlinear solutions have been obtained that match the cosmic background at infinity and for which Einstein gravity is recovered at short distances from the object [15]. For $f(G)$ gravity one can also argue the recovery of Einstein gravity at short distances, although the precise matching to the cosmic background at infinity is still an open issue [18].

The global effect of the new nonlinear terms in our inhomogeneous Universe has been largely left unexplored so far, and in fact for all studies of the cosmology for these models it was (often implicitly) assumed that, just as for Einstein gravity, the small scale structure plays a negligible role. However, both for DGP and $f(G)$ gravity, the present Universe consists of compact objects and structures separated by distances that are smaller or of the same order as their Vainshtein radius. So the linearization (4) will in fact never hold locally and one would not a priori expect our Universe to expand in the same fash-

ion as the corresponding homogeneous matter dominated FLRW universe. As a first step in addressing this issue, we will only consider those density fluctuations which are still in the linear regime, or on the brink of going nonlinear $\delta \lesssim 1$. The advantage being that we can still use the linear solution (4) that relates the fields to the densities. In the same way as we did for ordinary gravity, we can then estimate the contribution of the modes with wavelength L to the average of the nonlinear terms as:

$$\frac{\langle \nabla^2 \phi \nabla^2 \phi \rangle}{H^2} \sim H^2 |\delta_L|^2. \quad (9)$$

So we find that already mildly nonlinear density fluctuations $\delta_L \rightarrow 1$ seem to induce an order one backreaction. This corroborates our expectations since for those density fluctuations the corresponding 'gravitational energy density' in (8) becomes of the same order as their bare density. However, so far, we have not been explicit on the precise form of the nonlinear terms. In fact, it turns out that both for DGP and $f(G)$ gravity the contributions to the averaged equations of terms of the form (8) cancel out; or that the full average gravitational energy is small, of the same order as for Einstein gravity. As we will now show explicitly, the reason behind this lies in the shift symmetry for the relevant terms in these models.

For DGP gravity the higher order terms have been widely discussed in the literature (see [6] and citations therein). They are generated by the term in the Lagrangian (dropping the overall M_p^2 factor and with our normalization for π):

$$\mathcal{L}_\pi = -\frac{1}{H^2} \square \pi \partial_\mu \pi \partial^\mu \pi. \quad (10)$$

Besides having the obvious shift symmetry on π , this term is also invariant (upon partial integration and dropping subdominant derivatives of a) under a constant shift of the derivatives of π :

$$\pi \rightarrow \pi + c + c_\mu x^\mu. \quad (11)$$

This so called "Galilean" invariance is a consistency requirement, since it prevents the appearance of a new degree of freedom that has to be a ghost by Ostrogradski's theorem [19]. Indeed, the symmetry dictates that, although the Lagrangian contains four derivatives, the equation that follows from it will only contain second order derivatives, and no new degrees of freedom appear [20].

However, the normal shift symmetry by itself is sufficient to ensure a cancellation of the different averaged terms. Since by this symmetry the terms in the equation E_π , that follow from the Lagrangian (10), appear as a divergence of the associated Noether current. Explicitly, in the quasi-static and subhorizon regime, the relevant

terms are:

$$\begin{aligned} E_\pi^{(2)} &= \frac{2}{H^2 a^4} \partial_i (\nabla^2 \pi \partial_i \pi - \partial_i \partial_j \pi \partial_j \pi) \\ &= \frac{2}{a^4 H^2} (\nabla^2 \pi \nabla^2 \pi - \partial_i \partial_j \pi \partial_i \partial_j \pi) . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the setup (3), where the infinite wavelength modes are put in the background, the average of a (spatial) divergence is zero. As one can easily verify, for finite wavelength modes, the contributions to the average of the two terms on the last line of (12) cancel out.

The precise form of the higher order terms for $f(G)$ gravity has so far not been discussed in the literature. We will focus here on those terms that are relevant to the central theme of the paper, leaving a more detailed discussion for a forthcoming paper [16]. The $f(G)$ models are defined by adding some function of the Gauss-Bonnet invariant,

$$G \equiv R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} , \quad (13)$$

to the Einstein-Hilbert term R of the gravitational Lagrangian. The choice for this invariant is precisely motivated by the fact that the corresponding higher derivative equations only show one extra degree of freedom in addition to the spin-2 graviton [5]. This can be seen easily by eliminating the higher order derivatives through the introduction of a Lagrange multiplier λ [8]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{M_p^2}{2} (R + f'(\lambda)(G - \lambda) + f(\lambda)) . \quad (14)$$

In this way it is evident that the models are in fact equivalent to a scalar field with some potential (third and fourth term), no canonical kinetic term and a non-minimal coupling to G (second term). Due to the specific total derivative structure of G , this non-minimal coupling will generate at most second order derivatives (both of λ and the metric fields) in the full equations [8]. For those models that modify gravity at cosmological distances, the linear subhorizon fluctuations of the non-minimal coupling term will dominate over the potential. And with a proper normalization of the fluctuation $\pi \equiv H^2 f''(\lambda_0) \tilde{\lambda}$, where λ_0 is the FLRW background value, the linearized equations will then indeed be of the general form (4). This non-minimal coupling is also responsible for the dominant higher order corrections. In the quasi-static subhorizon limit, the breakdown of (4) will be due to the third order term (again dropping M_p^2):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda G}^{(3)} = f''(\lambda_0) \tilde{\lambda} G^{(2)} = \frac{8}{a^4 H^2} \pi (\nabla^2 \phi \nabla^2 \psi - \partial_i \partial_j \phi \partial_i \partial_j \psi) . \quad (15)$$

We again expect this term to have the full Galilean symmetry, since the equations that derive from it only contain second derivatives. And indeed, up to boundary

terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a^4 H^2}{8} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda G}^{(3)} &= \phi (\nabla^2 \psi \nabla^2 \pi - \partial_i \partial_j \psi \partial_i \partial_j \pi) \\ &= \psi (\nabla^2 \pi \nabla^2 \phi - \partial_i \partial_j \pi \partial_i \partial_j \phi) , \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which shows explicitly that the Lagrangian is invariant under a shift of all three fields and their derivatives separately. The shift symmetry by itself again guarantees that the terms, which now appear in all three equations H_{00} , H_i^i and E_π , are divergences that vanish upon averaging.

To conclude, our results suggest that a universal shift symmetry in the nonlinear Vainshtein screening mechanism, validates the conventional FLRW framework for large distance modifications of gravity. However, showing that this remains true in a more realistic universe, with highly nonlinear density fluctuations $\delta \gg 1$, requires going beyond our perturbative approach. In this light it is interesting to note that the very same shift symmetry was used recently to argue the equivalence principle for DGP gravity [21].

Finally, it's a pleasure to acknowledge the support of the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders (Belgium).

* Electronic address: karel.vanacoley@ugent.be

- [1] S. Deser, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **4** (1987) L99.
- [2] P. Brax, C. van de Bruck, A. C. Davis, J. Khoury and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 123518.
- [3] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett. B* **485**, 208 (2000).
- [4] S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 043528.
- [5] I. Navarro and K. Van Acoleyen, *JCAP* **0603**, 008 (2006).
- [6] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, *arXiv:0811.2197*.
- [7] K. Koyama and R. Maartens, *JCAP* **0601** (2006) 016.
- [8] A. De Felice, M. Hindmarsh and M. Trodden, *JCAP* **0608** (2006) 005.
- [9] E.V.Linder, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 043529.
- [10] B. Bertotti, L. Iess and P. Tortora, *Nature* **425** (2003) 374.
- [11] G. Dvali, *New J. Phys.* **8** (2006) 326.
- [12] A. Ishibashi and R. M. Wald, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 235 (2006).
- [13] E. R. Siegel and J. N. Fry, *Astrophys. J.* **628**, L1 (2005).
- [14] A. Lue, R. Scoccimarro and G. Starkman, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 044005.
- [15] A. Lue, R. Scoccimarro and G. D. Starkman, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 124015.
- [16] K. Van Acoleyen, in progress.
- [17] A. L. Erickcek, T. L. Smith and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 121501 (2006); I. Navarro and K. Van Acoleyen, *JCAP* **0702**, 022 (2007).
- [18] I. Navarro and K. Van Acoleyen, *Phys. Lett. B* **622**, 1 (2005); A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *arXiv:0907.1830*.
- [19] R. P. Woodard, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **720** (2007) 403.

- [20] Of course, this by itself does not guarantee that for some backgrounds the π excitation itself will be ghostlike [6]. A similar comment applies to $f(G)$ gravity [8].
- [21] L. Hui, A. Nicolis and C. Stubbs, arXiv:0905.2966.